DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 225 EA 023 756

AUTHOR Dimmock, Clive; Wildy, Helen
TITLE School-Based Management and Its Linkage with the Curriculum in an Effective Secondary School.
PUB DATE Jan 92
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, January 2-5, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Administrator Role; Foreign Countries; *School Based Management; *School Policy; Secondary Education; Secondary Schools; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (Perth)

ABSTRACT

Few studies of school effectiveness focus on curriculum management in secondary schools, especially schools situated in supportive socioeconomic environments. (Many studies have focused on poor, urban, elementary schools.) This paper reports the first part of a research project designed to investigate the link between curriculum and management processes in an academically effective secondary school. The aims of the study were to develop a conceptual framework, a methodology, and instrumentation to investigate these linkages. A naturalistic approach was used to clarify the perceptions, thoughts, and behaviors of principals and teachers by using a range of data collection methods that would yield descriptions of practice. Only one secondary school in the Perth (Western Australia) metropolitan area was selected to allow for an indepth analysis and the development of a research framework suitable for future, wider application. Major findings indicate that proactive curriculum management was only exercised on a departmental level. Although this school was academically effective, loose linkage between departments and between senior management and departments provided little opportunity for schoolwide curriculum policies. (24 references) (LAP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343225

PAPER FOR THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS FOR
SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
JANUARY 2-5, 1992

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT AND ITS LINKAGE WITH THE CURRICULUM IN AN EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Dimmock
H. Wildy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CLIVE DIMMOCK AND HELEN WILDY
THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

EA 023 756

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT AND ITS LINKAGE WITH THE CURRICULUM IN AN EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL

Clive Dimmock and Helen Wildy
The University of Western Australia

Initiatives to restructure school systems throughout the Western world have so far focussed attention on their organisational, administrative and governmental configurations. Characteristic features of these new arrangements - school-based management, devolution of responsibilities to principals, empowerment of teachers, and the creation of school-based decision-making groups and the encouragement of parental participation in school governance - are now familiar (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990). Shifting patterns of power and control between school and central office are more complex. Typically, the centre provides an explicit policy framework, with system guidelines and targets. While schools are given more discretion over the allocation of resources and the means by which they perform their work, the centre monitors their performance and ensures their accountability not only to the centre but also to newly empowered school decision-making groups.

Policy statements underpinning these trends aim to improve the quality of schooling, in terms of both curriculum reform and a concern for the quality of teaching and learning. Development of a national curriculum in Australia, for example, is underway and a national project on the quality of teaching and learning was launched in 1991. However, the links between the outcomes desired and the new organisational and administrative configurations expected to deliver them, are rarely explicated. The basis on which the connections are made remains more an act of faith than coherent exposition. There is some evidence that administrative and managerial restructuring do not necessarily impact on the curriculum (Caldwell, 1990). This concern led Bell (1991) to argue that discussions about school management, both by practitioners and by academics, had been more concerned with structures and processes of managing, than with 'demonstrating how effective management of those processes can directly

facilitate the processes of teaching and learning' (p.138). Further cause for concern is the absence of evidence to show how school management and organisation influences the quality of curriculum provision. Indeed, surprisingly little is known about how, and by whom, the curriculum is managed in schools.

Studies in the 1980s have shown what principals do to manage the curriculum, teaching and learning (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger and Mitman 1985; Rowan, Dwyer, & Bossert, 1982). With the accumulation of knowledge about principals' practices, some researchers, by the end of the 1980s, had shifted their focus away from principals' behaviours and tasks towards a concern for their thinking and problem-solving processes (Hallinger & McCary, 1990; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1990; Leithwood & Stager, 1989). Despite this shift of focus and a body of literature confirming the pivotal role of the principal in creating and sustaining the academic effectiveness of schools, a number of issues remain to be investigated Firstly, few studies have been undertaken of academically effective schools where the principal does not act as an educational leader. Secondly, few studies have looked at management of the curriculum throughout the school, embracing the contributions of deputy principals, senior teachers and teachers. To what extent do these compensate for lack of educational leadership of the principal? Thirdly, little is known about the effects of curriculum and management teams on the quality of curriculum, teaching and learning in schools.

This paper reports the first part of a research project designed to investigate the linkages between management processes and the curriculum in an academically effective secondary school. Few studies of school effectiveness focus on curriculum management in secondary schools, especially schools situated in supportive socio-economic environments. According to Murphy and Hallinger (1987), 'almost all of the effective schools studies have investigated poor, urban, elementary schools' (p. 181). The aims of this first study were to develop a conceptual framework, a methodology, and instrumentation to investigate these linkages. A future phase will examine the linkages between management processes and the curriculum in schools experiencing different levels of academic effectiveness,

and broaden the definition of effectiveness to incorporate the non-academic work of schools.

It is argued that the level of effectiveness of a particular school is associated with a critical mix of management variables operating in the school at the time and that management and curriculum variables interact at whole school, department and classroom levels. Interaction or linkage also takes place between the school and its environment. More specifically, it is hypothesised that if schools display a high level of effectiveness in terms of academic performance, then they are also likely to display high levels of proactive management which link with teaching and learning.

Method

An exploratory study using a naturalistic approach was used to develop a conceptual framework and instrumentation to investigate the relationships between management and curriculum. Our objective was to clarify the perceptions, thoughts and behaviours of principals and teachers by using a range of data collection methods which would yield thick descriptions of practice. One school was selected to allow for in-depth analysis and the development of a research framework suitable for future wider application. We do not claim that the findings from this study apply beyond the chosen school.

Framework

In this study the term 'curriculum management' is equivalent to Hallinger and Murphy 's (1985) reference to 'instructional management' and 'instructional leadership' and to Sergiovanni's (1984) 'educational leadership'. It encompasses planning, developing, monitoring and reviewing the educational programme of the school to ensure a match with school goals and to allocate resources appropriately.

The terms 'senior management' and 'senior managers' are used to denote the principal and two deputy principals: 'administrative team' is used when these three people operate as a decision making group. 'Senior teachers' means Department Heads and includes teachers-in-charge: there are two senior teachers in some of the larger departments. 'Senior staff' refers to the group comprising

the principal and two deputies together with all senior teachers. 'Teachers' covers classroom teachers as well as Year group coordinators.

The concept of linkage was developed to investigate the connections between management and curriculum. Four dimensions of linkage were recognised: its characteristics (tight-loose, direct-indirect, formal-informal), the structures involved, the means of communication employed, and the match between intention and practice.

Sample and setting

The first stage of this study was to select a school displaying high academic effectiveness. A government secondary school in the Perth metropolitan area was chosen. This school is regarded by the public as a "super school". It has been established for 20 years and serves a homogeneous middle class socio-economic catchment area. Analysis of its public examination results in 10 subjects over a period of three years in comparison with results from 23 similarly structured schools, together with analysis of the perceptions of a cross section of people associated with the school of the strengths of the school, showed the anecdotal evidence to be well founded. Comparisons were also made between the public examination results for students at each of the 24 schools and their scores on the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test (ASAT). The ASAT test is a multiple choice test designed to measure a student's ability to reason, comprehend, interpret and infer from a variety of material in the areas of humanities, social sciences, sciences and mathematics. It is claimed to be content free and is used to take account of differences in the academic abilities of students across different subjects. The mean score for students from each of the 24 schools on the ASAT test was compared with their mean score for the public examination. An indication of the 'value-added' component by each school could be gauged by the difference between the mean scores for schools on the ASAT and public examination. It was reasoned that the higher the public examination mean over the ASAT mean across the subject profile, the more academically effective the school. The school selected for this study had the most frequently occurring positive differences across subjects between public examination results and ASAT scores of all 24 schools. On the basis of this evidence we concluded that the sample school displayed a high level of effectiveness in terms of academic performance.

Instrumentation

The next step was to examine the extent to which this school displayed high levels of proactive management linking with high performance in teaching and learning. The concept of linkage has not been thoroughly explored in relation to curriculum management processes in the school setting. The study presents an exploratory investigation of the linkage between school-based management and academic effectiveness, in terms of teaching quality and learning outcomes.

Data were generated by a number of methods: semi-structured interviews with teaching staff from all levels in the organisational structure of the school; informal interactions with staff at recess periods; observation of formal meetings, and classroom teaching; examination of school documents; and the administration of a set of nine instruments designed to identify and measure linkage between management processes and teaching and learning variables. The technique of cross checking data from one source against data from other sources is in response to the warning expressed by Murphy, Peterson and Hallinger (1986) that what looks like one pattern or conclusion when one piece of data at a time is used can look quite different when multiple views are considered. They highlight the need to consider multiple data points simultaneously particularly in relation to the match between espoused policy and school practice.The data collection methods are listed below.

Interviews
Observation of teaching
Observation of meetings
Documentary analysis
Instruments:
Perceptions of the Principal's Tasks
Perceptions of the Principal's Roles
Task Responsibilities Instrument
Management Function Instrument
Impact Profile Instrument
Task/Person Orientation Instrument
Linkage: Quality and Style Instrument
Networks Instrument
Management Profile Sheet

Data were collected from the principal and the two deputy principals, from 11 senior teachers and 7 teachers, a total of 21 respondents. Analyses of data obtained from interviews, observations and instruments were performed following procedures advocated by Miles and Huberman (1984). Data were coded and analysed using the frameworks described earlier in this paper.

Results

Responsibility for Curriculum Management

The initial question generated data about who is perceived to be responsible for curriculum management. A distinction is made between who ought to be responsible and who is responsible in practice; between intention and reality. To establish which individuals or groups in the school were actually involved in managing the curriculum, data from the Task Responsibilities Instrument and the Management Function Instrument were examined. Table 1 shows the number of respondents who perceived the various individuals or groups to be responsible for curriculum monitoring and innovation.

Table 1

Perceptions of Responsibility for Curriculum Monitoring and Innovation

	Task	
School personnel	Monitoring	Innovation
Principal	2	4
Deputy (m)	0	0
Deputy (f)	0	0
Administrative team	1	2
Senior Teachers	20	16
Teachers	8	16

Note. Entries are the frequencies with which respondents perceived each person or group of school personnel to be responsible for each process involved in curriculum management.

Note. Respondents could nominate more than one person or group of school personnel.

Table 1 shows that curriculum monitoring and innovation is perceived to be the responsibility of senior teachers and teachers rather than any one senior manager or senior management as a team. This is supported by data presented in Table 2 from the Management Functions Instrument.

Table 2

Perceptions of Level of Contribution to Curriculum Management

	Level of Contribution		
School personnel	Minimum	Moderate	Maximum
Principal	15	3	3
Deputy (m)	18	2	1
Deputy (f)	18	3	0
Administrative team	17	4	0
Senior teachers	0	2	19
Teachers	1	10	10

Note. Entries are the frequencies with which the 21 respondents perceived each person or group of school personnel to make varying levels of contribution to curriculum management.

Table 2 indicates that respondents perceived the main contributors to curriculum planning, organisation, delivery and monitoring to be senior teachers and teachers. The principal and two deputies both as individuals and as a group were seen to contribute minimally. This view was confirmed by interviews data.

In contrast, however, is the perspective taken by principals and deputies of the formal role of the principal. The Perceptions of the Principal's Roles Instrument was administered to the three senior managers. In each case the curriculum management role defined as "possessing sound general knowledge about curriculum policy and its management" was seen to be either very significant or moderately significant. Table 3 presents the responses of the principals and two deputy principals.

Table 3

Perceptions of the Significance of the Principal's Curriculum Management Role by Senior Managers

	Level of significance			
Senior managers	Very	Moderately	Of little	Not at all
Principal			*	
Deputy (m)		*		
Deputy (f)		*		

Note. The symbol * appears whenever the principal's role as manager of the curriculum was perceived by the principal or one of the deputy principals to be of varying levels of significance in the current work of the principal.

It appears that senior managers in this school believe curriculum management to be part of the principal's role. However, neither the principals nor the deputies are seen to assume responsibility for curriculum management in practice. There is a discrepancy, therefore, between perceptions of roles and of practice in relation to curriculum management. Further investigation is needed to clarify whether senior teachers and teachers do see the role of the principal as encompassing curriculum management.

Indirect Linkage

The second and more subtle question, which is the main focus of this analysis, is how do managers at each level in the school operate to promote the high quality teaching and learning associated with high levels academic achievement characteristic of this school. The analysis sought to identify the existence of linkages and the quality of the linkage between school managers and management of the curriculum.

Despite the evidence that senior management has little direct involvement in curriculum matters, all the instruments revealed that the principal and the two deputies each played a part in promoting and sustaining academic performance. The Task/Person Orientation Instrument which

purports to measure the degree of direction and the degree of support given by school personnel to high performance in teaching and learning revealed that the principal was classified as high on task orientation. Table 4 shows the frequency with which respondents classified each of the senior managers on a two-by-two grid representing the two dimensions: degree of task orientation or direction and degree of person orientation or support.

Table 4

Perceptions of the Degree of Direction and Degree of Support given by Senior Managers

		Degree of task orientation (direction)	
		Low	High
Degree of person orientation (support)			
	High	Principal 3 Deputy (m) 10 Deputy (f) 7	Principal 9 Deputy (m) 10 Deputy (f) 9
	Low	Principal 0 Deputy (m) 0 Deputy (f) 2	Principal 9 Deputy (m) 1 Deputy (f) 3

Note. The entries represent the frequency with which the 21 respondents perceived the relationship of each of the senior managers to academic performance to be high or low in each of the two dimensions: task orientation and person orientation.

Table 4 indicates that 18 of the 21 respondents perceived the principal to be high in task orientation or direction in matters relating to teaching and learning. The two deputies are seen to provide support rather than direction: 20 of the 21 respondents saw the deputy (m) to be high in person orientation and 16 saw the deputy (f) to be high in person orientation. All three senior

managers are seen by most respondents to be high in either direction or support of academic performance.

Similarly, all three were seen to "actively encourage" high performance in teaching and learning. This is seen in the data from the Impact Profile Instrument. Perceptions of the way in which each of the senior managers impacts on high performance in teaching and learning is shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Perceptions of the Type of Impact on High Performance in Teaching and Learning

	Type of Impact				
School Personnel	Hinders	Laissez faire	Shows concern	Actively encourages	Positively inspires
Principal	1	1	2	14	3
Deputy (m)	0	2	8	12	0
Deputy (f)	1	2	2	15	1
Senior teachers	0	0	5	14	1
Teachers	0	0	2	17	0

Note. Entries represent the frequency with which the 21 respondents perceived each person or group of school personnel to have each type of impact on high performance in teaching and learning.

All three senior managers are seen by most of the respondents to "actively encourage" high quality teaching and learning in their school. It is apparent that senior managers are not involved in managing the curriculum in practice yet they are viewed to have a high level of impact on teaching and learning. In terms of the conceptualisation of linkage, senior managers in this school link indirectly rather than directly with teaching and learning. Subsequent analysis examines the way this indirect linkage occurs.

Data derived from the Linkage: Quality and Style Instrument were used to examine the way in which the principal links with staff and students to

enhance academic performance. Respondents identified three main groups of school personnel with whom the principal linked in promoting academic achievement: senior teachers, teachers and students. Table 6 shows the categories selected by most respondents when describing the way the principal interacted with senior teachers, teachers and students to promote high quality teaching and learning.

Table 6

Most Frequently Selected Descriptors of the Quality and Style of Linkage of the Principal with Senior Teachers, Teachers, and Students

		Senior Teachers	Teachers	Students
Quality of Linkage				
Frequency	continuously			
	regularly	*	*	*
	occasionally			
Type	praises	*	*	*
	encourages			
	constructively criticises	*		
Impact	high	*		
	medium		*	*
	low			
Style of linkage				
tells				
sells		*	*	*
consults				
negotiates				
delegates		*		

Note. The symbol * is used to show the descriptor(s) selected most often by the 21 respondents as characteristic of the linkage between the principal and each of senior teachers, teachers, and students in promoting academic achievement.

The principal was seen to link with students, teachers and senior teachers. His linkage was most often described as regular, using praise, in a manner which had medium impact. His interactions with senior teachers differed from those with teachers and students in that as well as giving praise he gave constructive criticism to senior teachers and he was seen to have higher impact. In addition to using a "selling" style the principal also adopted a "delegating" style with senior teachers when relating to matters of academic performance. This gives support to the earlier finding that, although it may be the formal role of the principal to manage the curriculum, in practice it is the responsibility of senior teachers.

The analysis suggests that the principal is seen to exert a high level of influence on students' academic performance yet he has low involvement in curriculum matters. On this basis it is concluded that the principal's linkage with teaching and learning is indirect. The perception is that the principal plays an important though indirect part in managing the curriculum. This is a tentative finding which needs further investigation. It contradicts generally accepted research evidence that the principals of effective schools are directly involved in managing the curriculum.

The principal. Having established that the principal links indirectly and significantly with student academic achievement, it is necessary to examine how this influence operates in the school. There were two main ways in which the principal indirectly fostered academic achievement: the presentation of awards to recognise student success and a sustained public relations programme involving formal and informal communications both inside and outside the school. The principal stated frequently that "we do not acknowledge each other enough". Accordingly, during his 6 years in the school, he had institutionalised structures designed specifically to give a wide range of students opportunity to experience public and personal recognition of their success. These included Dux Awards which are presented at Year level Assemblies for achievements within classes and within subjects. He used a wide variety of methods to convey the message of the school's achievements, for example the local press, staff noticeboards, the internal public address system, school newsletters, parent meetings, informal interactions with school members (parents, staff and students) and with those outside the

school. In addition, the principal initiated and produced a series of school publications for members of the school community aimed at promoting academic performance in the school. Each one covers a topic relating to student learning opportunities: "Guidelines for the Social Behaviour of Students", "Academic Success and Part time Jobs", "Homework Policy", and "Recent Research Findings," which summarises findings on student achievement in relation to school characteristics, family educational support and student attitudes.

In acknowledging student success and in transmitting this information through the public relations programme, the principal simultaneously fulfilled a number of other management tasks all of which helped to promote academic performance in the school: setting standards; reinforcing high expectations; building school climate and school identity; reinforcing school values; motivating students and teachers; and monitoring performance.

The principal's monitoring function was facilitated by his high level of visibility in the school, both formally and informally. For example, he attended all school events and at times adopted a low profile by helping put out chairs or check names on lists: on such occasions he operated at an informal level, monitoring performance, and relaying information concerning current or past success. A formal mechanism by which the principal monitored performance was his analysis of external examination results. Feedback from the Secondary Education Authority on Tertiary Entrance Examinations results provides senior management with some external measure of the relative performance of departments and individual teachers. The principal regularly used these data not only to highlight successful departments and teachers but also to identify weaknesses to provide a basis for redirecting funds, staff and training. Through this connection with departments and individual teachers, the principal operated indirectly to enhance the quality of teaching in the school.

Although it appears that the principal did not link directly with students in influencing their academic performance, he operated indirectly, both formally and informally, to promote teaching quality and student learning opportunity. He linked with staff, students, and parents through a range of communication modes and he devised structures to meet these goals.

The analysis so far has shown that the principal exerted an important and indirect link with the curriculum. The deputy principals did not link directly with curriculum issues. In the following section the contribution of each of the deputies is analysed to explain how they exert an influence to promote academic performance in a powerful but indirect way.

The deputy principal (female). The contribution of the two deputy principals, like that of the principal, to the management of the curriculum can be conceptualised as indirect rather than direct. The deputy principal female (deputy (f)) believed that she adopted a low profile in school management. She had occupied this position for 15 years, knew all school families and was respected by staff, students and parents. However, it was evident from observation of school practices, interviews with staff and students and informal discussion with parents that the deputy (f) had a powerful but indirect impact on academic achievement through her linkage with school values.These are expressed in the aims of the school:

> "to foster the pursuit of excellence, to facilitate the realisation of each students' potential, to respect and care for the individual, to develop in the individual self discipline, self motivation, and initiative, high standards of courtesy and consideration for others and a sense of pride for self, school, home and community"
>
> (Policy and Procedures, 1989, p.3)

The deputy (f) interacted with students individually and frequently in matters of school uniform, punctuality, and relationships with other students, with teachers and with parents. The office of the deputy (f) was located near the student recreation areas, removed from the genereal administration area. Her location symbolises her identification with student needs and provides a non-threatening atmosphere for interactions with students. Her high level of visibility and ease of access to students allowed her to act in a monitoring role in relation to standards of student behaviour. In these interactions she articulated and reinforced school rules and regulations and thereby promoted awareness and appreciation of school values. By instilling in students high expectations for achievement and behaviour, the deputy (f) directly fostered a school climate conducive to high performance in teaching and learning. Her

contribution can be viewed in three ways: from a practical point of view, she encourages student behaviour, such as punctuality, high levels of discipline and respect for teachers, which is conducive to effective learning experiences: again, at a practical level, by taking responsibility for student pastoral care, she frees the principal and deputy (m) to devote time and energy to other management tasks: and thirdly, there is a symbolic aspect of her work that the school places value on high expectations of student behaviour. Peterson, Murphy and Hallinger (1987) suggest that it may be such a combination of technical structuring elements and cultural signals that relates to high levels of student achievement. They would argue that in this sense there is tight linkage between the function of the deputy (f) and academic achievement in this school.

The deputy principal (male). On the other hand indirect, informal and unstructured linkage between the deputy (m) and the curriculum was revealed by data from the instruments and from interviews with staff members. The informal linkage between the deputy (m) and curriculum is seen by the role he assumed in the school rather than by his formal role. The formal role of the deputy (m) was to organise the school's programme, encompassing the timetabling for each semester, arranging duty rosters and room allocations, setting time lines for reporting procedures, and maintaining discipline, order, safety and cleanliness in the school. These were seen by staff members to be the tasks for which he was responsible. Table 7 shows the number of respondents who perceived school personnel to be responsible for school organisation (timetable, discipline, allocating staff, allocating students).

Table 7

Perceptions of Responsibility of School Personnel for School Organisation

	Task			
School personnel	Timetabling	Discipline	Staff allocation	Student allocation
Principal	4	2	7	1
Deputy (m)	20	18	14	6
Deputy (f)	4	17	2	10
Administrative team	11	9	6	6
Senior teachers	14	15	14	16
Teachers	2	17	0	5

Note. Entries are the frequencies with which the 21 respondents perceived each person or group of school personnel to be responsible for tasks related to school organisation.

Note. Respondents could nominate more than one person or group of school personnel.

It can be seen from Table 7 that the deputy (m), more than any other staff member, was perceived to be responsible for school organisation, although senior teachers were seen to be significantly involved in all aspects. Such duties require close attention to detail, deadlines and task completion. The data from the Task/Person Orientation Instrument (Table 4) indicate that the deputy (m) is perceived to be consistently high in person orientation. Only half of the respondents saw him to be high on task orientation. This discrepancy in the data from the two instruments reflects a tension between what he is expected to do in his role as deputy (m) in the school and his actual behaviour. This tension was evident in his observed behaviour, in his work practices and in information from both formal and informal interviews with staff members.

The discrepancy between the formal role of the deputy (m) and his actual behaviour was evident in his tendency to be indecisive and unfocused

in his work and unable to organise daily events. This was commented on by other staff members including both the principal and deputy (f). For instance, it was the principal who wrote the daily and weekly newsletters and kept a detailed programme of events on the staff noticeboard. To fill the gap a support team consisting of a computer specialist, a timetable specialist and a clerical assistant was established to conduct the tasks of organising the school in a systematic and orderly manner. The deputy (m) was not a working member of this team and so he was free to pursue a role which he forged himself, namely, roving 'trouble shooter'.

Like the deputy (f) he was shown by the Task/Person Orientation Instrument (Table 4) to possess high person orientation, indicating his preference for close and direct interpersonal contacts. He was highly visible in the school, adopting an informal style and enjoying a high profile in the staffroom and the playground, in the school corridors, at sporting events and at social functions. His interactions were face to face, verbal, spontaneous, informal and unstructured. It was in his assumed role of custodian of staff morale and goodwill among students and parents that he indirectly and subtlely reinforced school values. He linked directly with the staff, students and parents of the school in his frequent informal social interchanges. The attitudes and values that were conveyed in these exchanges reinforced the goals of the school. In this way the deputy (m) provided an indirect linkage with teaching and learning. Thus the deputy (m) had an indirect and informal connection with academic achievement through his role in fostering good spirits and promoting a shared sense of school identity.

On the basis of this analysis of the data in relation to curriculum management it is concluded that neither the principal nor the two deputy principals linked directly with the curriculum, although each played an indirect and important part in promoting teaching quality and student learning opportunity.

Direct Linkage

In addressing the initial question of who in the school is responsible for curriculum management it has been found that none of the senior managers was directly responsible. On the other hand, the data indicate that direct linkage between the curriculum and both teaching quality and student learning

opportunities came primarily from senior teachers. Gersten, Carnine and Green (1982) argue that this is to be expected - teachers do not perceive principals to be instructional leaders and principals typically do not act to foster teaching and learning in a direct way. This evidence also confirms the view expressed by Gersten et al., by Rallis and Highsmith (1986) and by Peterson, Murphy and Hallinger (1987) that curriculum management functions can be performed at different levels in the school's organisational structure. It confirms the view of Murphy (1989) that to examine instructional leadership in a school by studying the behaviours of the principal alone is to overlook much of what actually occurs in relation to managing the curriculum. The crucial issue appears to be whether there is tight coupling between the curriculum (or technical core) and management at some level in the school's structure.

Senior teachers.The data suggest that there is tight linkage between the curriculum and the middle level of management, the senior teachers. Senior teachers in each department, often in consultation with the teachers concerned, made decisions about the allocation of teachers to classes, the selection of text books, the planning of programmes, the setting of student assessment tasks, and the monitoring of teacher performance and students' achievement. There was evidence of curriculum innovation and this was initiated by the senior teachers. Opportunities for professional development of teachers were initiated by both senior teachers and teachers and not by principals or their deputies.

Teachers. The linkage between teachers and student learning opportunities and performance is conceptualised as tight. Evidence suggests both formal and informal linkage occurs, structured and unstructured and operating in two directions, from teachers to students and from students to teachers. It is therefore classified as tight linkage. Teachers in all departments were responsibile for lesson preparation and presentation, for classroom management, for setting and marking homework, and for monitoring students' progress. Data from the Task/Person Orientation Instrument (Table 4) indicates that teachers gave high direction and support to students to promote academic performance. The Impact Profile Instrument data (Table 5) show that teachers, more than any other group of school personnel, actively

encouraged students. Furthermore, data from the Linkage: Quality and Style Instrument revealed that the interactions of teachers with students were perceived as continuous, supportive, collaborative and having high impact. Table 8 shows the most frequently selected category describing the linkage between senior teachers and teachers, and between teachers and students.

Table 8

Most Frequently Selected Descriptors of the Quality and Style of Linkage of Senior Teachers with Teachers and of Teachers with Students

		Senior teachers with teachers	Teachers with students
Quality of linkage			
Frequency	continuously		*
	regularly	*	
	occasionally		
Type	praises		*
	encourages	*	*
	constructively criticises		*
Impact	high		*
	medium	*	
	low		
Style of linkage			
	tells		
	sells		*
	consults		
	negotiates	*	*
	delegates		

Note. The symbol * is used to show the descriptor(s) selected most often by the 21 respondents as characteristic of the linkage between senior teachers and teachers, and between teachers and students in promoting academic achievement.

Teachers are perceived to interact continuously with students, to use a variety of strategies in their interactions with students and to have high impact.

Teachers exerted pressure on their colleagues and on their students to perform at high levels. Table 8 shows the ways in which senior teachers linked with teachers in curricular matters. Teachers, in turn, were subject to pressures from almost all other groups in the school - especially from senior teachers, from other teachers, from students and from parents. Teachers stated that students acted as though high quality learning experiences were not a privilege but a right. They demanded that the school live up to their expectations.

Teaching quality was believed to be high across most departments. It was generally acknowledged that this was the case despite the fact that the calibre of teachers was reported to be no different from that in any other government secondary school. New teachers were closely supervised and supported by senior teachers and other teachers within the more integrated departments. Teachers themselves believed that their performance was enhanced by the high level of student motivation, the absence of classroom behaviour problems, the expectations of parents and the reputation of the school.

The tight linkage between senior teachers and teachers at departmental level that existed was seen to be the essence of curriculum management. The linkage was regular, formal and informal, both structured and unstructured and direct and therefore it is classified as tight. Table 8 shows that senior teachers interact regularly with teachers in curriculum matters, that they encourage teachers and that they have medium impact. The predominant style of interaction used by senior teachers is one of negotiation.

The regular informal and unstructured linkage between senior teachers and teachers resulted from the working conditions in departments. Staff in each department worked together in department areas and taught in neighbouring rooms: frequently staff members remained in the department office during recess and lunch breaks. Their close physical proximity, the amount of time spent together and the blending of the working and social

environments provided teachers and senior teachers with frequent opportunities for spontaneous informal interactions.

There were also formal linkages between senior teachers and teachers. Each department had formal weekly staff meetings. These meetings were chaired by the senior teachers and held in the department office. Through these meetings senior teachers and teachers confronted and resolved such issues as course content, programming, student assessment, and course evaluation. In these ways, formal and informal, stuctured and unstructured, the links between senior teachers and teachers were forged within the departments and it is through this tight linkage that the curriculum was managed.

During interviews and informal interactions, frequent reference was made to the length of service of staff members. Investigation revealed that although the largest proportion of staff members had been at the school for less than 5 years, 14 of the 89 staff members had been at the school for more than 10 years. Of the 11 senior teachers, 4 had been on the staff for more than 10 years.

It could be argued that the longer the time at a school, the greater the likelihood that staff members identify with and share the values of the school and that they pass these values on to new staff members. This influence is more likely to be expressed in departments where senior teachers are in daily face to face formal and informal contact with teachers.

Loose Linkage

Despite the evidence of close identity with school values among long serving members of the school staff, there was no evidence of a school-wide approach to reviewing the curriculum or its relevance to student needs, student abilities, school aims or broader societal goals. Each department operated as a unit, loosely linked with other departments through common school activities and shared concerns over issues like the protection of teaching time. There appeared to be even less linkage between departments and senior management in curriculum matters.

There was one striking exception to this pattern. The library was seen by the principal to be "the heart of the school" and it did in fact serve a linking function. It was centrally located and used for school activities and for formal

and informal meetings of staff and parents. It operated as a link not only between the school and parents but also between departments in the school. The senior teacher had implemented a policy of integrating the library facilities into the programmes offered in each department so that every student used the library routinely in each subject. The library staff actively fostered this linkage with every department in a number of ways: by continually reviewing the need for new books, by timetabling lessons in the library, and even by checking the wording of assignments set by teachers to ensure compatibility with the objectives of the library. It was the principal who initiated the upgrading of the library, directed its funding and staffing and regularly monitored its performance. The library is therefore not only an example of a formal, structured and direct link between departments, and between a department and senior management: it is also an example of the way the principal operates in an indirect way to promote teaching and learning in the school.

The senior staff group is potentially a formal link between senior management and senior teachers and also a point of contact for senior teachers as a group. Typically it meets weekly to review and monitor the curriculum. Its absence in this school underscores the idiosyncratic interpretation of roles by the principal and deputy principals who performed three fortuitously complementary functions without consulting formally as a group. There was even less likelihood that they met formally with the group of senior teachers. It also highlights the looseness of that school's organisational structure and the lack of opportunity for forging school-wide policy for curriculum development.

Discussion

In this study we have reported data generated by interview, informal interaction, observation, school documents and a set of nine instruments to identify the linkage between management processes and teaching and learning in an academically effective school. A postulate of the study was that schools experiencing high levels of academic effectiveness would be characterised by proactive school-site management linking with, and supporting, teaching and learning (Beare, Caldwell, & Millikan, 1989).

There are four main findings that can be drawn from the analysis. Firstly, none of the senior managers is directly involved in curriculum management. Secondly, the principal and two deputy principals do play an indirect and important part in promoting academic performance by reinforcing school values in a wide variety of ways. Thirdly, curriculum management is the responsibility of senior teachers and there is tight linkage between both senior teachers and teachers and high quality teaching and learning. Finally, the loose linkage between departments, and also between departments and senior management, provides little opportunity for a school-wide approach to curriculum matters. It is evident that no whole school curriculum management operates in this school.

These four findings are discussed in this final section of the paper. The major finding was, contrary to the initial postulation, the general absence of proactive management by principals and deputy principals in the sample school. None of the senior managers were direct instructional leaders. High quality teaching and learning do not appear to be the product of systematic and integrated planning, developing, monitoring and reviewing of the school's educational programme by senior managers. High academic performance appears to be related, not to proactive management on the part of senior managers, but to tight linkages within departments. The absence of direct instructional leadership by the principal conflicts with much of the evidence on effective schools highlighting the pivotal role of principals as instructional leaders (Brookover et al., 1982; Lipham, 1982; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986). A key issue concerns the contribution which the principal, in particular, can make to enhancing teaching and learning. In this instance the question is, if the principal had exercised direct instructional leadership, what improvement in teaching and learning might have been expected in a school which is already academically effective?

Another important issue concerns the different perceptions held by senior managers and teachers about the principal's curriculum management role. This is confirmed in a further study of principals' instructional leadership practices in Western Australia (Wildy & Dimmock, in press). Principals and deputy principals saw curriculum management as part of their responsibility, while senior teachers' and teachers' perceptions were that

senior managers were not involved in managing the curriculum. Indeed, some teachers argued that the focus of senior management on administrative duties protected and shielded teachers from interruption, thus contributing to the curriculum in an indirect way. Nevertheless, the different perceptions are cause for concern. If principals and deputies see curriculum management as part of their role, do they also think they are fulfilling these duties? If so, their staff disagree. A dichotomy exists between perceptions and expectations. If they do not see themselves as *de facto* curriculum managers is it because their other roles intrude? Is devolution of additional responsibilities to the school likely to distance senior managers from the curriculum even more?

A second finding concerns the principal and deputy principals, who exerted considerable influence on teaching and learning through indirect and subtle ways. By creating and maintaining a climate conducive to high standards of teaching and learning they made success possible. They could be described as indirect instructional leaders. This reinforces Murphy's view (1989) that to concentrate on only the direct linkages is to fail to identify much of the work of senior managers in instructional leadership roles. It also agrees with Leithwood's findings (Leithwood, 1990), that two patterns of principal practices in particular are associated with school effectiveness - direct and indirect instructional leadership.

The third finding concerns the high responsibility assumed by senior teachers in collaboration with teachers for proactive curriculum management. The department in these secondary schools is the hub of many tight formal and informal linkages and networks. It is the proactive management of the educational programme by teachers and senior teachers at department level that promotes and sustains the high academic achievement for which the school is widely acknowledged. In this sense, proactive curriculum management is exercised, but at departmental level. Two observations are noteworthy. Firstly, it is unclear whether the curriculum management role assumed by senior teachers has been delegated by principals, or whether it has been acquired by default. With increasing complexity of the curriculum it is reasonable that decisions be taken as close to the point of implementation as possible. Secondly, the calibre of many senior teachers, judged by their experience, qualifications, credibility and professional standing was

impressive. They displayed high standards in all aspects of their work. Departments in this school were tightly and effectively managed.

An additional factor exerting considerable influence on the quality of teaching and learning is the pressure brought to bear by parents on teachers and students, and by students on teachers. Teachers were under pressure from parents and students to maintain and improve teaching to secure high student learning outcomes. While the school effectiveness literature is consistent in portraying the importance of high teacher expectations of students' academic performance (Brookover et al., 1982; Renihan & Renihan, 1984), this research uncovered the importance of the reciprocity of student and teacher expectations. Students place pressure on teachers by expecting and demanding good teaching; teachers equally have high expectations of students. Teachers are currently under considerable stress at the centre of many curriculum changes. They feel exposed with little support other than from their senior teachers. Senior managers were not providing technical, moral or emotional support to teachers. Parents played a pivotal role by physically and symbolically supporting the values of the school and by exercising high expectations for student achievement.

Fourthly, loose linkage between departments, and between senior management and departments provides little opportunity for school-wide curriculum policies. Yet this school was academically effective in terms of high student achievement. This finding conflicts with the evidence from effective schools research of tight coupling within the curriculum (Murphy et al.,1985). It is worth speculating on the learning gains which might have arisen if the curriculum had been tightly coupled. Where principals and deputy principals fail to provide direct curriculum management it is unlikely that a school will provide a coherent, coordinated, balanced, and differentiated curriculum for each of its students. Only senior managers are in a position to adopt an overview of the whole curriculum. Effective as individual departments may be, there is need for overseeing goals, programme consistency with the goals, appropriate resource allocation and assessment. Department management cannot compensate for lack of curriculum management at senior level.

This exploratory study presents an insight into how the curriculum is managed in an effective secondary high school in Western Australia. Generalisation of results awaits further studies using a larger and more varied sample. Nevertheless, the justification for this type of research focusses on the need to investigate the complexities of curriculum management at school level. This study attempts to develop a methodology and a conceptual framework by which deeper insight may be gained into ways of securing better learning outcomes for students through more effective curriculum management in schools.

References

Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1989). Creating an excellent school : Some new management techniques. London: Routledge.

Bell, L. (1991). Educational management : An agenda for the 1990s. Educational Management & Administration, 19(3), 136-140.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal : Perspectives on school leadership (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Brookover, W., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., & Tomatzky, L. (1982). Creating effective schools : An inservice program for enhancing school learning climate and achievement. Holmes Beach, Flo: Learning Publications.

Caldwell, B. (1990). School-based decision-making and management : International developments. In J. Chapman (Ed.), School-based decision-making and management (pp. 3-26). Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

Gersten, R., Carnine, D., & Green, S. (1982). The principal as instructional leader : A second look. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 47-50.

Hallinger, P., & McCary, C.E. (1990). Developing the strategic thinking of instructional leaders. The Elementary School Journal, 91(2), 89-108.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behaviour of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217-247.

Leithwood, K. A., Begley, P. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1990). The nature, causes, and consequences of principles practices : An agenda for future research. Journal of Educational Administration, 28(4), 5-31.

Leithwood, K.A., & Stager, M. (1989). Expertise in principals' problem-solving. Educational Administration Quarterly. 25 (2), 126-161.

Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 309-339.

Lipham, J. M. (1982). Effective principal, effective school. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R., & Kranz, J. (1990). What do we know about school-based management? A case study of the literature - A call for research. In W. H. Clune & J.F. Witte (Eds.), Choice & control in American education volume 2. The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring (pp. 289-3420. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis : A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Murphy, J. (1989, September). Studying instructional leadership : Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems. Keynote paper presented at the Australian Council for Educational Administration Graduate Student Seminar, Armidale, NSW.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership : Concepts, issues, and controversies (pp. 179-203). Newton, Massachusetts : Allyn & Bacon.

Murphy, J., Peterson, K. D., & Hallinger, P. (1986). The administrative control of principals in effective school districts : The supervision and evaluation functions. The Urban Review, 18(3), 149-175.

Murphy, J., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1985). School effectiveness : A conceptual framework. The Educational Forum, 49(3), 361-374.

Peterson, K. D., Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). Superintendents' perceptions of the control and coordination of the technical core in effective school districts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23(1), 79-95.

Rallis, S. E., & Highsmith, M. C. (1986). The myth of the 'great principal' : Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 300-304.

Renihan, F. I., & Renihan, P. J. (1984). Effective schools, effective administration, and institutional image. The Canadian Administrator, 24(3), 1-6.

Rowan, B., Dwyer, D., & Bossert, S. (1982, March). Methodological considerations in the study of effective principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 4-20.

Wildy, H., & Dimmock, C. (in press). Instructional leadership in Western Australian primary secondary schools. Journal of Educational Administration.